and income is permitted. Besides the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) have initiated several measures for investor protection which would also cover NRI investors.

(b) No, Sir.

(c) No, Sir.

(d) and (e) In view of the reply to parts (b) and (c), replies to these two parts do not arise.

Letters written by MPs.

3395. SHRI MOHAMMED AFZAL *alias* MEEM AFZAL: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) what is the number of letters written by the Members of Parliament to the Ministry during the period from 1st April, 1994 to 31st March, 1995 alongwith year wise details thereof;

(b) what is the number of letters acknowledged out of them;

(c) what is the number of letters in respect of which final replies were sent: and

(d) what is the break-up of final letters issued by the Ministry containing positive and negative replies respectively.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI M. V. CHANDRASHEKARA MURTHY): (a) to (d) The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House as soon as possible.

HBA to employees of State Bank of Indore, Delhi

3396. SHRI VIRENDRA KATARIA: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to refer to answer to Unstarred question 1099 given in the Rajya Sabha on 21st March, 1995 and state:

(a) the actual amount of house building advance sanctioned to each of 12 employees of the Delhi branches of State Bank of Indore and the place for which the advance was sanctioned in each case and whether there has been change of place of the house for which the advance was sanctioned, if so, the details thesreof:

(b) whether there has been a change of policy relating to the actual inspection of the houses built with Government advance as this work was earlier entrusted to the State Bank of India; if so; when;

(c) whether the co-auditors of the Bank have actually inspected the houses or site and satisfied themselves that the conditions stipulated in the sanction have been satisfied in each case; and

(d) if not, what steps are proposed to be taken by the Bank to ensure compliance of the conditions laid down in the sanction order in each case?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI M. V. CHANDRASHEKARA MURTHY): (a) to (d) The details of actual amount of house building advance sanctioned to each of the 12 employees through Delhi branches of State Bank of Indore and the places for which the advances were sanctioned are as under:—

Sl. No.	Name of the Employee	Amount drawn (Rs. in lakhs)	Place of construction
1	2	3	4
1.	Mr. M.L. Sonker	1.50	Chandigarh
2.	Mr. Prarveen Sharma	1.82	Bahadurgarh
3.	Mr. Manoj Katniwalia	..	Loan not availedo s far
4.	Mr. M F. Khan	1.50	Ghaziabad
5.	Ms. Vinita Khirwardker	2.27	Gwali or

6.	Mr. R.K. Gupta	1.75	Mathura
7.	Ms. Tripti Dogra	1.25	Gurgaon
8.	M. S. K. Jain	2.01	Delhi
9.	Ms. Asha Panickar	1.37	Bhopal
10.	M. G.C. Chaturvedi	1.495	Pinahat, Agra
11.	M. Rajendra Kumar	1.60	Delhi
12	Ms. Sunita Mehta	1.50	Delhi

The Bank has further reported that in all the cases where the advance has been availed of, the construction has taken place/being done at the particular sites for which the loan was sanctioned. The Bank has further reported that in 7 of the 11 cases, the inspections have been carried out of the Bank officials. In 4 cases where house/flat has been/is being constructed by the Government agency/ builders, inspections have not been down. While the inspections are being carried out generally by the branch officials at various staged of construction, the Bank has also reported that conditions stipulated at the time of sactioning the advance in respect of 10 of the 12 employees have been generally fulfilled by them. The bank has reported that there is no requirement in the rules for the inspection of the houses constructed by the employees withthe Bank's finance being carried out by State Bank of India etc.

While in one case the advance has not been availed of, in the other, the amount of advance availed of does not appear to have been utilised fully for the purpose for which it was sanctiond. The bank has been advised to ensure compliance with the terms of sanction in this case.

Credit facilities to new borrowers by SBI

3397. SHRI VIRENDRA KATARIA: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Delhi-local head office of the S.B.I. is not in a position to settle the proposal for sanctioning credit facilities to new prospective borrowers even after six months from the date on which the proposal was cleared and forwarded by the local branch of the Bank to Delhi Head Office;

(b) whether any time frame has been fixed for clearing such proposals, if so, the details thereof;

(c) whether report of MCKINSEY & Co. and American consultant regarding system improvement in SBI has been received by the Bank;

(d) if so, the details therefor and the action taken so far; and

(e) by when action on the Report is expected to be completed?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI M. V. CHANDRASHEKARA MURTHY): (a) State Bank of India (SBI) have reported that its Delhi Local Head Office normally sanctions large credit proposals where the data is complete, within a time frame of 8 weeks

(b) For large credits, Reserve Bank of India (RBI) has stipulated the following time limits from the date of receipt of complete data/particulars:—

(i) Proposals for sanction of fresh/enhanced credit facilities — 60 days